

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are amended above. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the Specification.

Claims 1 to 8 and 18 are now pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of this response.

Claims 1, 5, 8, and 18, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,870,087 to Chau (“Chau reference”).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Chau reference does not identically describe or suggest each and every feature of the claims, as amended above, as required for anticipation.

The Chau reference refers to an MPEG decoder system and method for performing video decoding and includes transport logic, a system controller, and MPEG decoder logic. The Chau reference refers to using a single unified memory which stores code and data for the transport, system controller and MPEG decoder functions; and the video decoding system implements various frame memory saving schemes, such as compression or dynamic allocation, to more efficiently use the memory in order to provide a video decoding system with reduced memory requirements. According to Chau, the focus on reducing memory requirements is because the amount of memory is a “major cost item” in the production of video decoders.

In contrast, amended claim 1 of the present invention concerns a device for receiving data transmitted using asynchronous data transmission technology, the device including a data-independent clock signal and a memory device, and *storing the received data for the required period of time in order to compensate for transmission delays et seq.* In the claimed invention, the independent data clock signal is sent to the memory device for readout of the data. The Chau reference does not identically describe or teach storing the received data for long periods of time to compensate for transmission delays. Further, the Chau reference appears to *teach away* from the present invention of the use of additional memory since its entire purpose is to reduce the memory requirements, as quoted above. The present invention is concerned with implementing a sufficiently large memory device in the transmitter, so that the data received are stored during a period required for compensating transmission delays. The present invention further is focused on compensating for wander by making the period between the two disturbances caused by wander so long that the effect of the disturbances is reduced. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 5, 8, and 18, are allowable. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of those claims.

Claims 2 to 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chau reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,652,627 to Allen (“Allen reference”). Claims 2 to 4 depend ultimately from amended claim 1 and are believed allowable over the Chau reference for the reasons explained above. The Allen reference does not cure that deficiency.

The Allen reference refers to a video transmission system that regulates the timing of the video and audio signals regardless of the transport mechanism used to deliver the digitized signals from the source to a set top box. The Allen reference refers to replacing a program clock reference in the audio and video transport packets with a new time derived from a high reliability source; a constant value is then derived from the new PCR value to be added to a program time stamp and a decode time stamp; and, the buffer size is increased merely by the amount of the constant times the bit rate of delivery of the packets. The Allen reference (as well as the Chau reference) does not teach or describe, among other things, *storing the received data for the required period of time in order to compensate for transmission delays et seq.* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 to 4 are allowable, and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of the Chau and Allen references.

Claims 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chau reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,703,877 to Nuber et al. (“Nuber reference”). Claims 6 and 7 depend ultimately from amended claim 1 and are believed allowable over the Chau reference for the reasons explained above. The Nuber reference does not cure that deficiency. The Nuber reference refers to processing audio data from a packetized data stream carrying digital television information in a succession of fixed length transport packets in which detected audio packets are monitored to locate subsequent PTS's for adjusting the timing at which audio data is output, thereby providing proper lip synchronization with associated video. The Nuber reference refers to reacquiring the audio data stream (when errors in more than one audio frame occur) and concealing the audio output. The Nuber reference (as well as the Chau reference) does not teach or describe, among other things, *storing the received data for the required period of time in order to compensate for transmission delays et seq.* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6 and 7 are allowable, and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the Chau and Nuber references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e), 103(a) have been overcome, and that claims 1 to 8 and 18 are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn, and that the present application issue as early as possible.

In efforts to further the prosecution, Applicants kindly request an interview with the Examiner to discuss the above application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Friday, November 23, 2012
(November 22, 2012 is a USPTO Holiday)

By: /Linda Lecomte/
Linda Lecomte (Reg. No. 47,084)
KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646